

*Am*



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/612,766	07/10/2000	James L. Hepworth	23802-250800	8887

20350 7590 02/24/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/612,766

Applicant(s)

HEPWORTH ET AL.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' Amendment filed on 10/15/2004.
2. Claims 28-33 are added.
3. Claims 1-33 are pending in this application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2162

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-15, 17, 19, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,009,459 issued to Belfiore et al. (hereinafter Belfiore) in view of US Patent No. 5,881,131 issued to Farris et al. (hereinafter Farris) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,041,326 issued to Amro et al. (hereinafter Amro).

With respect to claim 1, Belfiore teaches automatically creating a search string including the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name, and famous name based on the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name, and famous name entered by the user (the search string is automatically created when a user enters text that cannot interpreted a URL of a web page, that is, web browser automatically formats a search query using user-entered text and forward the query to an Internet search engines, which located web pages containing the query term or search string such as trademark or company name and return a list of search results; col. 3, lines 60-67, col. 4, lines 1-8; also see abstract);

receiving a URL address of Web page on the Internet to be searched (after the searching, the search engine locates the URL addresses of web pages on the Internet: col. 5, lines 40-50); accessing and searching contents of the Web page of the URL address received for matches in the contents of the web page corresponding to the search string wherein the searched contents includes elements other than only a domain name (the content of web page is located by search engine, and the content of web page is displayed, web page is typically encoded in HTML and most HTML

document is identified by a tag or meta tag that gives the elements names and attributes, followed by a content, followed by an end tag. When the search string is found a matched web page is retrieved by a server and or a HTML document is returned, that is, the searched content is including text, URL, HTML: col. 5, lines 40-55);

and providing search results of identified matches in the contents of Web page corresponding to the search string, providing search results of identified matches in the contents of the Web page corresponding to the search string, each category including at least one character string corresponding to a number of occurrences of the identified matches within the category, the category selected from the group consisting of a meta-tag, a hidden text, a text, a title, a hyperlink, and an image text, and wherein the report displays the at least one character string (the search results are displayed as the entered-text is matched based on the search string, that is, entered text or search string retrieved from a search engine from which search results or given web pages are obtained and displayed to the user; col. 5, lines 10-30).

Belfiore teaches automatically creating searching, receiving URL and accessing and providing search result and category the user-entered text (col. 7, lines 52-65). Also Belfiore teaches searching and locating the web page by receiving the user- entered text. Belfiore does not explicitly teach entering, by a user, the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name, and famous name to be searched in the Web page on the Internet. Belfiore does not explicitly teach entering, by a user, the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name to be searched in the Web page on the Internet. However, Farris teaches receiving the search string from GUI to search

Art Unit: 2162

the registered trademarks and trade names (see fig. 19, item 139 and col. 39, lines 47-59 and col. 30, lines 46-67 and col. 31, lines 1-67). Also Farris teaches searching the Web and searching the particular information among all public sites that are the part of the Web and comparing the data or the result values (col. 40, lines 15-25). Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Farris to the system of Belfiore for the user-entered search string including at least one of trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name to search in the Web page on the Internet in order to get the search result based on the user-entered search query/string. Belfiore and Farris do not teach comparing current search results with prior search results.

However, Amro teaches comparing the search results of the search engine "hits" with the previous "hits" (see fig. 8, col. 11, lines 60-67).

Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris, and further in view of Amro, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Amro to the system of Belfiore to provide a search over the Internet for potentially user of trademarks in domain names and other web page content in order to enforce the trademark rights within the whole Internet.

With respect to claim 2, Belfiore in view of Farris teaches a method of searching and reporting as discussed in claim 1.

Belfiore teaches automatically creating searching, receiving URL and accessing and providing search result and category the user-entered text (col. 7, lines 52-65). Also Belfiore teaches searching and locating the web page by receiving the user- entered

text. Belfiore does not explicitly teach entering, by a user, the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name, and famous name to be searched in the Web page on the Internet. Belfiore does not explicitly teach entering, by a user, the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name to be searched in the Web page on the Internet. However, Farris teaches receiving the search string from GUI to search the registered trademarks and trade names (see fig. 19, item 139 and col. 39, lines 47-59 and col. 30, lines 46-67 and col. 31, lines 1-67). Also Farris teaches searching the Web and searching the particular information among all public sites that are the part of the Web and comparing the data or the result values (col. 40, lines 15-25). Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Farris to the system of Belfiore for the user-entered search string including at least one of trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name to search in the Web page on the Internet in order to get the search result based on the user-entered search query/string. Belfiore and Farris do not teach wherein the at least one character string is a number of the identifying matches within the category.

However, Armo teaches the contents of result or hit based on search criteria pr parameters or condition abstract, col. 4, lines 7-25 and col. 10, lines 7-35).

Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris, and further in view of Amro, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Amro to the system of Belfiore to provide a

Art Unit: 2162

search over the Internet for potentially user of trademarks in domain names and other web page content in order to enforce the trademark rights within the whole Internet.

With respect to claim 3, Belfiore teaches an encrypted connection authenticated by a certificate server (to secure for sending the message: server with a search engines generates a script that is executed when a hyperlink is selected; col. 36-50 and col. 8, lines 1-27).

With respect to claim 4, Belfiore teaches wherein the search results highlight the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name found in the web page (to secure for sending the message: server with a search engines generates a script that is executed when a hyperlink is selected; col. 36-50 and col. 8, lines 1-27).

Claim 6 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 7 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 9 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.



With respect to claim 11, Belfiore teaches a remote computer system connected to the computer system via the Internet for accessing the software program (server computer, client computer and web Browser: see fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 41-60).

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a software program for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a software program for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a software program for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a software program for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 17, Belfiore teaches wherein the search contents includes at least two of the following portions of the Web page: a domain name, a meta tag, hidden text, visible text, titles and images (HTML document or meta tag of HTML and hyperlinks: see fig. 9 and col. 7, lines 6-50).

With respect to claim 19, Belfiore teaches wherein the search contents includes at least two of the following portions of the Web page: a domain name, a meta tag,

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Art Unit: 2162

hidden text, visible text, titles and images (HTML document or meta tag of HTML and hyperlinks: see fig. 9 and col. 7, lines 6-50).

With respect to claim 23, Belfiore teaches wherein the report displays the at least one character string in a column format for at least one of the meta-tag, the hidden text, the text, the title, the hyperlink, and the image text (displaying the search results in the report as a text file, or HTML: col. 5, lines 6-59 and col. 6, lines 8-67; also see abstract).

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 23 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 21 hereinabove.

7. Claims 5, 10, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,009,459 issued to Belfiore et al. (hereinafter Belfiore) in view of US Patent No. 5,881,131 issued to Farris et al. (hereinafter Farris) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,422,523 issued to Siegel and US Patent No. 6,041,326 issued to Amro et al. (hereinafter Amro).

With respect to claim 5, Belfiore teaches Belfiore teaches automatically creating a search string including the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name, and famous name based on the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name, and famous name entered by the user (the search string is automatically created when a user enters text that cannot interpreted a URL of a web page, that is, web browser automatically formats a search query using user-entered text and forward the query to an Internet search engines, which located web pages containing the query term or search string such as trademark or company name and return a list of search results; col. 3, lines 60-67, col. 4, lines 1-8; also see abstract);

receiving a URL address of Web page on the Internet to be searched (after the searching, the search engine locates the URL addresses of web pages on the Internet: col. 5, lines 40-50); accessing and searching contents of the Web page of the URL address received for matches in the contents of the web page corresponding to the search string wherein the searched contents includes elements other than only a domain name (the content of web page is located by search engine, and the content of web page is displayed, web page is typically encoded in HTML and most HTML document is identified by a tag or meta tag that gives the elements names and

Art Unit: 2162

attributes, followed by a content, followed by an end tag. When the search string is found a matched web page is retrieved by a server and or a HTML document is returned, that is, the searched content is including text, URL, HTML: col. 5, lines 40-55);

and providing search results of identified matches in the contents of the Web page corresponding to the search, providing search results of identified matches in the contents of the Web page corresponding to the search string, each category including at least one character string corresponding to a number of occurrences of the identified matches within the category, the category selected from the group consisting of a meta-tag, a hidden text, a text, a title, a hyperlink, and an image text, and wherein the report displays the at least one character string (the search results are displayed as the entered-text is matched based on the search string, that is, entered text or search string retrieved from a search engine from which search results or given web pages are obtained and displayed to the user; col. 5, lines 10-30).

Belfiore teaches automatically creating searching, receiving URL and accessing and providing search result and category the user-entered text (col. 7, lines 52-65). Also Belfiore teaches searching and locating the web page by receiving the user- entered text. Also, Belfiore teaches automatically creating searching, receiving URL and accessing and providing search result and category the user-entered text (col. 7, lines 52-65). Belfiore does not explicitly teach entering, by a user, the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name, and famous name to be searched in the Web page on the Internet. However, Farris teaches receiving the search string from GUI to search the registered trademarks and trade names (see fig. 19, item 139 and col. 39, lines 47-59

Art Unit: 2162

and col. 30, lines 46-67 and col. 31, lines 1-67). Also Farris teaches searching the Web and searching the particular information among all public sites that are the part of the Web and comparing the data or the result values (col. 40, lines 15-25). Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Farris to the system of Belfiore for the user-entered search string including at least one of trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name to search in the Web page on the Internet in order to get the search result based on the user-entered search query/string. Belfiore and Farris do not teach automatically creating homonyms and phonetic for the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name entered by user. However, Siegel teaches talking database and dictionary database including a plurality of words and distribution of the sounds of them (col. 11, lines 38-67 and col. 12, lines 1-9 and lines 47-50; also see col. 7, lines 58-62). Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris and further Siegel, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Siegel to the system of Belfiore for the constructing homonyms and phonetic of the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name entered by the user. Belfiore, Farris and Siegel do not explicitly teach comparing current search results with prior search results.

However, Amro teaches comparing the search results of the search engine "hits" with the previous "hits" (see fig. 8, col. 11, lines 60-67).

Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris, and further in view of Siegel and Amro, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2162

invention was made to combine the teachings of Amro to the system of Belfiore to provide a search over the Internet for potentially user of trademarks in domain names and other web page content in order to enforce the trademark rights within the whole Internet.

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a software program for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 18, Belfiore teaches wherein the search contents includes at least two of the following portions of the Web page: a domain name, a meta tag, hidden text, visible text, titles and images (HTML document or meta tag of HTML and hyperlinks: see fig. 9 and col. 7, lines 6-50).

With respect to claim 20, Belfiore teaches wherein the search contents includes at least two of the following portions of the Web page: a domain name, a meta tag, hidden text, visible text, titles and images (HTML document or meta tag of HTML and hyperlinks: see fig. 9 and col. 7, lines 6-50).

With respect to claim 21, Belfiore in view of Farris and Siegel teaches a method of searching and reporting as discussed in claim 5.

Belfiore teaches automatically creating searching, receiving URL and accessing and providing search result and category the user-entered text (col. 7, lines 52-65). Also

Art Unit: 2162

Belfiore teaches searching and locating the web page by receiving the user- entered text, Belfiore teaches automatically creating searching, receiving URL and accessing and providing search result and category the user-entered text (col. 7, lines 52-65).

Belfiore does not explicitly teach entering, by a user, the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name, and famous name to be searched in the Web page on the Internet. Belfiore does not explicitly teach entering, by a user, the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name to be searched in the Web page on the Internet. However, Farris teaches receiving the search string from GUI to search the registered trademarks and trade names (see fig. 19, item 139 and col. 39, lines 47-59 and col. 30, lines 46-67 and col. 31, lines 1-67). Also Farris teaches searching the Web and searching the particular information among all public sites that are the part of the Web and comparing the data or the result values (col. 40, lines 15-25). Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Farris to the system of Belfiore for the user-entered search string including at least one of trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name to search in the Web page on the Internet in order to get the search result based on the user-entered search query/string. Belfiore and Farris do not teach automatically creating homonyms and phonetic for the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name entered by user. However, Siegel teaches talking database and dictionary database including a plurality of words and distribution of the sounds of them (col. 11, lines 38-67 and col. 12, lines 1-9 and lines 47-50; also see col. 7, lines 58-62). Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris

and further Siegel, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Siegel to the system of Belfiore for the constructing homonyms and phonetic of the at least one trademark, tradename, celebrity name or famous name entered by the user. Belfiore, Farris and Siegel do not explicitly teach wherein the at least one character string is a number of the identifying matches within the category.

However, Amro teaches the contents of result or hit based on search criteria pr parameters or condition abstract, col. 4, lines 7-25 and col. 10, lines 7-35).

Therefore, based on Belfiore in view of Farris, and further in view of Siegel and Amro, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Amro to the system of Belfiore to provide a search over the Internet for potentially user of trademarks in domain names and other web page content in order to enforce the trademark rights within the whole Internet.

Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 21 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 21 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 24, Belfiore teaches wherein the report displays the at least one character string in a column format for at least one of the meta-tag, the hidden text, the text, the title, the hyperlink, and the image text (displaying the search results in the report as a text file, or HTML: col. 5, lines 6-59 and col. 6, lines 8-67; also see abstract).



Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 24 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 21 hereinabove.

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 21 except that it is directed to a system for searching and reporting an incidence rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 21 hereinabove.

8. Claims 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,009,459 issued to Belfiore et al. (hereinafter Belfiore) in view of US Patent No. 5,881,131 issued to Farris et al. (hereinafter Farris) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,422,523 issued to Siegel and US Patent No. 6,041,326 issued to Amro et al. (hereinafter Amro) and US Patent No. 5,898,836 issued to Freivald et al. (hereinafter Freivald).

With respect to claims 28-29, Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro discloses a system as discussed in claim 5.

Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro do not teach wherein the information relating to the owner of the URL address conducting the unauthorized use includes a name and an address and wherein informing the owner of the unauthorized use includes delivering a cease and desist letter.

However, Freivald teaches detecting the web page document by using the checksum for checking the document or information typed in and a unique URL is specified for each web page including password or name and address information (col. 3, lines 28-40 col. 4, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro with the teachings of Freivald by incorporating the use of a checksum method and URL including name and address for detecting the web page or web server. The motivation being to detect the web pages on the Internet to be changed.

With respect to claims 30-31, Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro discloses a system as discussed in claim 10.

Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro do not teach wherein the information relating to the owner of the URL address conducting the unauthorized use includes a name and an address and wherein informing the owner of the unauthorized use includes delivering a cease and desist letter.

However, Freivald teaches detecting the web page document by using the checksum for checking the document or information typed in and a unique URL is specified for each web page including password or name and address information (col. 3, lines 28-40 col. 4, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro with the teachings of Freivald by incorporating the use of a checksum method and URL including name and address for detecting the web page or web server. The motivation being to detect the web pages on the Internet to be changed.

With respect to claims 32-33, Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro discloses a system as discussed in claim 16.

Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro do not teach wherein the information relating to the owner of the URL address conducting the unauthorized use includes a name and an address and wherein informing the owner of the unauthorized use includes delivering a cease and desist letter.

However, Freivald teaches detecting the web page document by using the checksum for checking the document or information typed in and a unique URL is specified for each web page including password or name and address information (col. 3, lines 28-40 col. 4, lines 1-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Belfiore in view of Farris, Siegel and Amro with the teachings of Freivald by incorporating the use of a checksum method and URL including name and address for detecting the web page or web server. The motivation being to detect the web pages on the Internet to be changed.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**Contact Information**


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to (571) 273-4039. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center (703) 872-9306

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANH LY   
FEB. 16<sup>th</sup>, 2005